

SECTION M-1

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Pursuant to FAR 52.252-1, "SOLICITATION PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (FEB 1998)," the following provisions are incorporated herein by reference:

A. FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION CONTRACT PROVISIONS: None

B. AIR FORCE MATERIAL COMMAND FAR CONTRACT PROVISIONS: None

1.0. BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD

1.1. The Government intends to conduct a negotiated competition and will select one Offeror based on the proposal providing the "best value" to the Government, all factors considered. If adequate price competition does not exist, certified cost and pricing data will be required. The Government reserves the right to award no contract at all.

1.2. The Offerors' written proposals will be evaluated on the extent to which they meet or exceed the requirements of the CFI. This evaluation will include an assessment of the risks inherent in the approach proposed by each Offeror and the means to reduce/mitigate those risks.

1.3. The Government intends to award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements and represents the best value after evaluation in accordance with the factors and subfactors in this solicitation. Offerors are advised that a proposal meeting solicitation requirements with the lowest estimated cost may not be selected if award to a higher cost Offeror is determined to be most advantageous to the Government.

1.4. The Government intends to conduct discussions in accordance with FAR 15.306 and to request proposal revisions in accordance with FAR 15.307. However, the Government reserves the right to award a contract without discussions with Offerors. Therefore, each initial offer should contain the Offeror's best terms.

1.5. Proposal information provided for one factor may be used to assess other factors if the Government deems it appropriate. However, the Government is not required to use information provided for one factor to assess other factors, unless the Offeror makes specific references from one volume or section to the next. The Government may use Concept Demonstration Phase (CDP) information in its evaluation. The Government also may use information other than that provided by the Offeror in its evaluation. A deficiency in one area of a proposal may result in the entire proposal being found to be unacceptable. Past performance problems not addressed by the Offeror will be considered to be still in existence.

1.6. The Government, at its election, may conduct on-site inspections of the Offerors' facilities for purposes of verifying proposal information. The inspection, if done, will be used in the evaluation.

2.0. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Government will evaluate proposals against the following factors and subfactors as depicted in the evaluation criteria matrix below. Aspects under each subfactor will not be separately evaluated. All factors listed below are of equal importance.

Evaluation Criteria Matrix

Affordability Factor			EMD Factor		
Air Vehicle	Autonomic Logistics	Remaining Life Cycle Cost	Technical	Management	Cost
Proposal Rating (B/G/Y/R)	Proposal Rating (B/G/Y/R)	Most Probable Cost (MPC): URF-\$/AC; Other Procurement Costs-\$/AC; Operating and Support Costs-\$/Flt Hr	Proposal Rating (B/G/Y/R)	Proposal Rating (B/G/Y/R)	MPC EMD - \$
Proposal Risk (L/M/H)	Proposal Risk (L/M/H)		Proposal Risk (L/M/H)	Proposal Risk (L/M/H)	
Past Performance Factor					
Past Performance Confidence Assessment Rating (E/VG/S/M/U)					
General Considerations: Acceptable or Unacceptable					

Notes:

Affordability Factor = EMD Factor = Past Performance Factor

All Affordability subfactors are equal

EMD subfactors Technical and Management are equal; individually, each is more important than Cost.

2.1. Affordability Factor. Under this factor, the Air Vehicle, Autonomic Logistics, and Remaining Life Cycle Cost subfactors are of equal importance. The Air Vehicle and Autonomic Logistics subfactors will be evaluated and assigned a color proposal rating and a proposal risk assessment in accordance with AFFARS 5315.305 rating definitions, and in accordance with the criteria set forth in paragraphs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 below. Within these two subfactors, the proposal rating and proposal risk assessment will be considered in evaluating the proposals. The proposal risk assessment is no less significant than the proposal rating. The Remaining Life Cycle Cost subfactor will be evaluated in terms of the Government Most Probable Cost (MPC) estimates for Unit Recurring Flyway, Other Procurement Costs (Non-recurring Rate Tooling, Training, Data, Peculiar Support Equipment, Initial Spares), and Operating and Support Costs (O&S) in accordance with paragraph 2.1.3 below.

2.1.1. Air Vehicle Subfactor. This subfactor will be evaluated for the Offeror's potential ability to meet air vehicle performance requirements set forth in the JMS. This subfactor consists of the following aspects:

2.1.1.1. Air Vehicle Open Architecture. The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability of the JSF Air Vehicle to possess the attributes of an open architecture: 1) modular structure and partitioning; 2) well defined, preferably non-proprietary, internal and external interfaces; 3) use of standards adopted by standards bodies or the commercial marketplace; 4) controlled coupling among subsystem elements; 5) scalability and evolvability with minimal impact to the system; 6) ability of the Air Vehicle to function within the context of the Air System as a node in the C4I 2010 system of systems architecture; 7)

technology independence and parts obsolescence risk mitigation; 8) support for reliability and maintainability; 9) guaranteed timing and real-time execution; 10) information assurance and protection. This evaluation also includes the completeness of the architecture models, consistency of information mapped across the models, and the ability of the architecture to support the Source Selection Aspects of Interoperability, and Data Fusion and Information Management. The evaluation of this aspect will include an assessment of the Offeror's potential ability to meet the JMS.

2.1.1.1.1. Evaluation of the Air Vehicle Functional Model will include identification of functional elements; rationale for partitioning; mapping to discrete hardware and software elements within the Hardware and Software Models; throughput and data transfer rates within and among functional elements in the context of the Dynamics Model; and time-phased implementation of discrete functions mapped to the Block development plan.

2.1.1.1.2. Evaluation of the Air Vehicle Hardware Model will include assessment of rationale that supports the defined hardware partitioning (including selection of processor types and quantities); evidence of installed hardware performance that supports processor, memory, and network resource sizing decisions in the context of the Dynamics Model; mapping of the Hardware Model to the Block development plan; and direct traceability to Section L-12, Attachment 17, Mission Systems and Purchase Equipment input spreadsheets for each hardware partition.

2.1.1.1.3. Evaluation of the Air Vehicle Software Model will include assessment of rationale that supports software partitioning and computer software configuration item (CSCI) definition; use of commercial or other off-the-shelf products and criteria for their selection; identification of critical timing relationships associated with guaranteed execution of system actions within maximum allowable timelines, and methods to meet these relationships; mapping of the Software Model components to the Block development plan; and direct traceability to Section L-12, Attachment 17, Mission Systems and Purchase Equipment input spreadsheets for each software component.

2.1.1.1.4. Evaluation of the Air Vehicle Information Model will include assessment of the linkage to the JSF Information Exchange Requirements (IERS) and JSF Internal IERS (IIERS) as contained in the JMS; and the mapping of IER/IIER implementation to the Block development plan.

2.1.1.1.5. Evaluation of the Air Vehicle Dynamics Model will include traceability from operational and mission analyses that establish operationally stressing conditions to the derivation of tactical timeline constraints on system performance and subsequent allocation to subsystem performance. The evaluation will cross-check the system and subsystem timeline constraints against real-time performance and schedulability analysis in the context of the Software and Hardware Models. Pilot Vehicle Interface allowances and assumptions shall be identified as they apply to the derivation of events, timelines and activity deadlines.

2.1.1.2. **Interoperability.** The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability of the JSF Air System to meet the requirements of the JMS. This evaluation will include an assessment of the ability of the components of the JSF Air System to communicate and exchange data with required OPFACs in accordance with established standards; characterization of the utility of offboard data in the context of the JSF Air Vehicle Information Model; methods and ability of the JSF Air System to incorporate required offboard information into the JSF information products for offensive and defensive situational awareness; ability of the JSF Air System to evolve within the context of 2020 C4I architecture and beyond.

2.1.1.3. **Data Fusion and Information Management.** The proposal will be evaluated for potential ability of the Offeror's proposed Air System to provide multi-sensor (including offboard) data fusion and

information management to produce the required fidelity of information for pilot situational awareness and weapons and countermeasures employment supportive of the mission timeline, from mission planning through execution and debrief. The evaluation of this aspect will include an assessment of the Offeror's potential ability to meet the JMS, and SOO paragraphs 3.2 and 3.4.

2.1.1.4. **Lethality.** The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability of the JSF Air Vehicle to carry and accurately employ all JMS stores and the gun system in accordance with the JMS requirements. This will also include evaluation of the sensors' ability to search, detect, locate, identify, and designate targets consistent with Air Vehicle JMS target engagement requirements. The evaluation of this aspect will include an assessment of the Offeror's potential ability to meet the JMS, and SOO paragraphs 3.2 and 3.4.

2.1.1.5. **Survivability.** The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability of the JSF Air Vehicle to defeat or avoid missile threats and/or survive damage effects. The evaluation of this aspect will include an assessment of the Offeror's potential ability to meet the JMS, and SOO paragraph 3.2. The proposal will also be evaluated for the potential ability of the JSF Air Vehicle to meet the RF Signature requirements, including both KPPs, in accordance with SOO paragraphs 3.2 and 3.4.

2.1.1.6. **Up and Away Performance.** The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability of the JSF Air Vehicle to meet the following JMS requirements for Up and Away Performance: Combat radius, Maximum speed, Sustained "G," and Acceleration in accordance with the JMS, and SOO paragraph 3.2.

2.1.1.7. **Carrier Variant (CV) Performance.** The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability of the JSF CV Air Vehicle variant to meet Powered Approach Speed (V_{pa}), CV waveoff, CV bolter, and CV handling qualities requirements in accordance with the JMS, and SOO paragraph 3.2.

2.1.1.8. **STOVL Variant Performance.** The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability of the JSF STOVL Air Vehicle variant to meet Short Take-Off, Vertical Landing and STOVL handling qualities requirements in accordance with the JMS, and SOO paragraph 3.2.

2.1.1.9. **Robustness.** The proposal will be evaluated for the potential of the JSF Air Vehicle design to be developed in the proposed schedule while accommodating: potential Diminishing Manufacturing Sources (DMS), customer unique requirements, interchangeability between the primary and alternate engines, overall service life, system growth requirements, and a block development approach in accordance with the JMS, and SOO paragraphs 3.2 and 3.4.

2.1.2. **Autonomic Logistics Subfactor.** This subfactor will be evaluated for the Offeror's potential ability to meet autonomic logistics performance requirements set forth in the JMS. This subfactor consists of the following aspects:

2.1.2.1. **Operational Logistics Effectiveness.** The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability of the JSF Air System to meet Sortie Generation Rate, Logistics Footprint, and Mission Reliability in accordance with the JMS, and SOO paragraph 3.6.

2.1.2.2. **Reliability and Maintainability Attributes.** The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability of the JSF Air System to meet the JSF Air Vehicle's reliability and maintainability performance requirements in accordance with the JMS, and SOO paragraph 3.6.

2.1.2.3. **Support System Concept.** The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability of the JSF Air System to affordably support and sustain requirements in accordance with the JMS, and SOO paragraph 3.6.

2.1.2.4. Training System Concept. The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability of the JSF Air System to affordably produce mission qualified pilots and maintainers to sustain service requirements in accordance with the JMS, and SOO paragraph 3.6.

2.1.2.5. Information System Concept. The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability of the JSF Autonomic Logistics information systems to meet design, functional, and interoperability requirements and interface offboard mission planning resources while affordably and effectively supporting the JSF Air System and sustain requirements within the context of the Air System architecture in accordance with the JMS, and SOO paragraph 3.6.

2.1.3. Remaining Life Cycle Cost Subfactor. Government Remaining Life Cycle Cost MPC estimates will be developed for remaining life cycle costs which include Unit Recurring Flyway, Other Procurement Costs (Non-recurring Rate Tooling, Training, Data, Peculiar Support Equipment, Initial Spares), and O&S costs. Remaining Life Cycle costs include the costs for all variants. The Government Remaining Life Cycle MPC estimates will include, but not be limited to, Propulsion Systems, the costs of GFP, and consideration of technical risks. The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated for realism, completeness, and reasonableness, to determine if it is consistent with the Offeror's technical approach and reflects a clear understanding of the requirements. As part of the evaluation, the Government may consider other information extrinsic to the Offeror's proposal that the Government deems relevant.

2.1.3.1. Unit Recurring Flyaway Costs. This aspect will be evaluated for realism, completeness, and reasonableness using the Joint Common Cost Model (JCCM). Recurring Flyway costs include all recurring airframe, propulsion, avionics/mission systems, and armament costs, as well as Engineering Change Order costs.

2.1.3.2. Other Procurement Costs. This aspect will be evaluated for realism, completeness, and reasonableness using the JCCM, and will consist of the following:

2.1.3.2.1. Non-recurring Rate Tooling Costs. Non-recurring Rate Tooling Costs will be evaluated for realism, completeness, and reasonableness using the JCCM. Non-recurring Rate Tooling Costs includes costs associated with production rate tooling.

2.1.3.2.2. Training. Training will be evaluated for realism, completeness, and reasonableness using the JCCM. Training is defined as the deliverable training devices, accessories, aids equipment, and parts used to facilitate instruction. This element includes all effort associated with the production of deliverable training equipment.

2.1.3.2.3. Data. Data will be evaluated for realism, completeness, and reasonableness using the JCCM. This element refers to technical publications, engineering data, management data, and support data.

2.1.3.2.4. Peculiar Support Equipment. Peculiar Support Equipment (PSE) will be evaluated for realism, completeness, and reasonableness using the JCCM. PSE costs include all costs associated with items required to support and maintain the air system. PSE includes support and handling equipment, vehicles, ground equipment, tools, etc., used to fuel, service, deliver, hoist, overhaul, inspect, and otherwise maintain the mission equipment.

2.1.3.2.5. Initial Spares. Initial Spares will be evaluated for realism, completeness, and reasonableness using the JCCM. Initial spares and spare parts is defined as the deliverable spare components, assemblies, and sub-assemblies used for initial replacement purposes in the materiel system equipment

end item. Initial Spares includes the reparable spares and repair parts required as initial stockage to support and maintain newly fielded systems or subsystems during the initial phase of service.

2.1.3.3. Operating and Support Costs. The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated for realism, completeness, and reasonableness, to determine if it is consistent with the Offeror's O&S concepts and approach and reflects a clear understanding of the requirements. As part of the evaluation, the Government may consider other information extrinsic to the Offeror's proposal that the Government deems relevant.

2.2. EMD Factor. Under this factor, the Technical and Management subfactors are of equal importance; individually, each is more important than the Cost subfactor. The Technical and Management subfactors will be evaluated and assigned a color proposal rating and a proposal risk assessment in accordance with AFFARS 5315.305 ratings definitions, and in accordance with the criteria set forth in paragraphs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 below. Within these two subfactors, the proposal rating and proposal risk assessment will be considered in evaluating the proposals. The proposal risk assessment is no less significant than the proposal rating. The Cost subfactor will be assessed in terms of the Government MPC for the EMD Phase in accordance with paragraph 2.2.3 below.

2.2.1. Technical Subfactor. This subfactor will be evaluated for the Offeror's complete understanding of and potential ability to implement critical technical processes and plans necessary to successfully execute the JSF EMD phase. This subfactor consists of the following aspects:

2.2.1.1. Ground and Flight Test Plan. The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability to implement a comprehensive, realistic, efficient, and effective Ground and Flight Test Plan for the JSF EMD phase in accordance with SOO paragraph 3.4 and 3.5. The evaluation of this aspect will include review of the proposed approach to assess how ground and flight test requirements will be accomplished, ensure aircraft test assets and resources required to execute the plan have been identified, ensure that the test program fully integrates the customer into the flight test team, and that the Offeror has identified all necessary Government and contractor facilities.

2.2.1.2. Validation and Verification Plan. The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability to implement a comprehensive, realistic, efficient, and effective Validation and Verification Plan for the JSF EMD phase in accordance with SOO paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5. The evaluation of this aspect will include review of the proposed approach to ensure that JMS requirements can be demonstrated during the ground and flight test program, the Offeror has an in-depth understanding of how the JMS requirements will be phased in accordance with the Offeror's block development plan, and the JMS requirements flow down to a set of data requirements for implementation during the EMD phase. The Offeror's plan will also be evaluated to ensure that a complete set of exit criteria for each block has been identified to demonstrate that the JSF Air System has met stated performance as defined in the JMS and Section L-12, Appendix C, Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4.

2.2.1.3. EMD Manufacturing Plan. The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability to implement an effective Manufacturing Plan for the JSF EMD phase in accordance with SOO paragraph 3.3. The evaluation of this aspect will include review of the proposed approach for ensuring manufacturing rate and quality requirements are met; the Offeror's manufacturing approach has the potential to meet URF cost, rate and quality goals of the program while also ensuring a low risk transition into LRIP and full rate production; and that data are effectively collected for URF cost calculations for EMD and beyond.

2.2.1.4. Software Development Plan. The proposal will be evaluated for the Offeror's potential ability to implement an effective software design, development and support process, as documented in the Offeror's Software Development Plan (SDP), for the JSF Air System in accordance with SOO paragraphs 3.2, 3.4, and 3.6. The evaluation of this aspect will include review of the proposed processes and infrastructure for software development; integration of these processes with the overall systems engineering process and MS&A activities; design for re-use of software components for affordability; business, management and process control strategies with vendor subcontractors; the approach for phasing or blocking of the development, integration, test, and fielding of discrete software functions; the processes to accommodate unique requirements or implement tailoring of functional requirements; System/Software Engineering Environment (tool-set, facilities, and processes for accommodating System/Software Engineering Environment component obsolescence); assessment of the software development effort, including identification of cost, schedule and technical risk, risk management, and ability to achieve SEI software capability maturity model (CMM) or equivalent (e.g., SDCE) rating of Level 3 (minimum) across the JSF prime and vendor subcontractor team, including assessment criteria and processes employed to achieve the rating; application of software metrics; and the systems engineering processes that document the selection, implementation of, and conformance with selected technical standards.

2.2.1.5. Interoperability Plan. The proposal will be evaluated for the Offeror's potential ability to implement a comprehensive system engineering and management process plan that defines the approach for establishing and maintaining JSF Air System interoperability with required external operational facilities (OPFACs), in accordance with the JMS, consistent with the JSF C4I Support Plan, and in accordance with SOO paragraphs 3.2, 3.4, 3.6 and 4.2. The evaluation of this aspect will address the soundness of the Offeror's approach for the addition, modification, or removal of air system functions and interfaces to achieve interoperability with off-board systems. Methods for Information Exchange Requirement (IER) verification, documentation of standards conformance, interoperability assessments, test, and certification will also be assessed. The proposal will be evaluated based upon incorporation of common, inherent design characteristics (at both air system and air vehicle level), for the systems/platforms listed in the JMS, in order to enhance interoperability with those platforms.

2.2.1.6. Architecture Strategy. The proposal will be evaluated for the Offeror's potential ability to define and implement an Air System open architecture that minimizes total ownership cost (TOC) of the JSF Air System via: reduction of time required to design, develop and integrate new or modified functions; minimization of both the time required and number of affected components associated with regression testing of new or modified functions; processes for technology refreshment consistent with the Autonomic Logistics support strategy and with minimal disruption to operation and maintenance of the fielded system; elimination of diminishing manufacturing source impacts on the production of new aircraft and support and training systems and maintenance of the fielded system, in accordance with SOO paragraphs 3.2, 3.4, 3.6 and 4.2. The evaluation of this aspect will include an assessment of the Offeror's ability to define, instantiate, and maintain the open architecture in conjunction with vendor subcontractor team members; application of the Offeror's defined overall systems engineering process, to include the software development process and application of the Systems Engineering and S/SEE tools in the development of software components; rationale for the selection of the software development tools within the S/SEE that support the Air System open architecture; software re-use sources, levels and criteria; methods for incorporating re-used software components in the software build process. The evaluation of this aspect will include an assessment of the ability of the open architecture to sustain the evolution of the Air System through technology insertion cycles and proposed Block development. The evaluation of this aspect will include an assessment of the process for managing orderly transition from one block development to the next within the context of the Air System open architecture. The evaluation will also

include an assessment of the application of the processes proposed for management of technology insertion, functionality growth, and diminishing manufacturing source impacts.

2.2.1.7. Simulation Based Acquisition (SBA) Plan. The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability to implement and execute an effective SBA Plan for the JSF EMD phase in accordance with SOO paragraphs 3.5 and 6.3. The SBA Plan will be evaluated on its ability to ensure best value and reduce air system development risk in the areas of cost, schedule, and technical performance. This evaluation will cross a broad range of program areas affected by an integrated SBA strategy, from management (e.g., program control and cost) to technical (e.g., design, build, integration, verification, test & evaluation, manufacturing, training). The Offeror's SBA Plan will be evaluated for thoroughness, vision, adherence to the Government M&S Support Plan, and shared M&S responsibility between the Government and industry. The SBA Plan shall address Distributed Product Description (DPD) development, maintenance and access, and will be evaluated for completeness, linkage to software/systems engineering environment and engineering development models, adherence to standards, open architecture, and use of the Government M&S Support Plan. The SBA plan will be evaluated against the JSF SBA principles of an aggressive, collaborative, integrated, and extensible SBA approach.

2.2.1.8. Alternate Engine EMD Plan. The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability to implement a comprehensive and effective Alternate Engine EMD Plan for the JSF EMD phase in accordance with SOO paragraph 3.2. The evaluation of this aspect will include, but is not limited to, review of the proposed Alternate Engine systems engineering approach as well as the flight test plan to ensure the Offeror has a comprehensive and realistic approach to (1) achieve ground and flight test objectives for the Alternate Engine Program as well as aircraft test assets and resources required to execute the Alternate Engine Ground and Flight Test Plan, (2) meet JSF plug-and-play objectives and (3) mature system definition through in-depth understanding and resolution of integration issues. It should also be well coordinated with the Baseline EMD Program.

2.2.1.9. Autonomic Logistics Plan. The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability to implement an effective Autonomic Logistics Plan for the JSF EMD phase in accordance with the JMS, and SOO paragraph 3.6. The evaluation of this aspect will include, but is not limited to, assessment of the detailed plans showing how the autonomic logistics system will be developed, tested and evaluated during EMD, that the autonomic logistics test and evaluation plans are executable and meet cost and schedule requirements, the plan adequately addresses how effectiveness of each element of autonomic logistics (Air Vehicle, Joint Distributed Information System, Infrastructure, and Training) will be measured, and the plan adequately describes the tasks, resources and schedule requirements to demonstrate autonomic logistics.

2.2.2. Management Subfactor. This subfactor will be evaluated for the Offeror's complete understanding of and potential ability to implement essential management processes and plans necessary to successfully execute the JSF EMD phase. This subfactor consists of the following aspects:

2.2.2.1. Organization and Infrastructure. The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability to effectively implement appropriate organizational structure, plans, processes, interfaces, teaming arrangements (including IPT managed propulsion), international aspects, Work Breakdown Structure, Statement of Work, and practices required to effectively manage the JSF EMD phase in accordance with SOO paragraphs 2.0, 6.1 and 6.2. The proposal will also be evaluated for the potential ability to manage, transmit and archive data requirements during the JSF EMD phase. This aspect will also be evaluated to ensure the Offeror's proposed infrastructure (facilities, I/T, information systems) is sufficient to support the program in accordance with SOO paragraph 6.2.

2.2.2.2. Systems Engineering. The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability to effectively manage the engineering development of an integrated air system to meet SOO and JMS requirements in accordance with SOO paragraphs 3.2, 3.4, 3.6, 4.0 and 6.3. The evaluation of this aspect will assess critical contractor system engineering processes including, but not limited to, integrated product development; mass properties management, requirements analysis, traceability, and technical control; CAIV and trade studies; design integration and interface management; Air system supportability and life cycle cost; integrated risk management; and configuration management (including international aspects).

2.2.2.3. Subcontractor Management. The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability to effectively manage the interfaces and flow of responsibilities between the Offeror, its subcontractors/vendors and the Government in accordance with SOO paragraphs 2.0 and 6.2. The evaluation of this aspect will include, but is not limited to, review of the processes proposed for subcontractor requirement flow-down and traceability, subcontractor competition, subcontractor selection, subcontractor management processes, supplier data and information management, plan for utilization of commercial and non-developmental items, small/disadvantaged business utilization, and the GFE/GFP/GFI.

2.2.2.4. Cost Schedule and Control. The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability to effectively manage program cost and schedule during the JSF EMD phase in accordance with SOO paragraphs 2.0, 3.4, 5.1, 6.1 and 6.2. The evaluation of this aspect will include, but is not limited to, review of the proposed approach to earned value management, performance measurement baseline, EAC estimation and tracking, integrated master plan (IMP), the Integrated Master Schedule (IMS), and cost and schedule integration.

2.2.2.5. Program Security. The proposal will be evaluated for the potential ability to effectively implement the proper planning and processes to meet program security requirements in accordance with SOO paragraph 6.1; the JMS; and the Section L-12, Appendix F, JSF Program Protection Development Plan, dated November 2000. The evaluation of this aspect will include, but will not be limited to, assessment of, the adequacy of the Program Protection Implementation Plan; evidence that the contractor-owned system certification is commensurate with the data processed and supports development activities; and evidence that plans to ensure export licenses are in place to allow technology exchange with participating foreign contractors.

2.2.3. Cost Subfactor. A Government EMD MPC estimate will be developed for the JSF EMD phase using the JCCM. The MPC estimate will include, but not be limited to, EMD Contract Cost, Propulsion Systems, the costs of GFE and consideration of technical risks. The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated for realism, completeness and reasonableness. As part of the evaluation, the Government may consider other information extrinsic to the Offeror's proposal that the Government deems relevant.

2.3. Past Performance Factor.

2.3.1. General. Past performance is a separate evaluation factor. Under the Past Performance factor, a single Performance Confidence Assessment Rating will be assessed. This rating will represent the evaluation of the Offeror's present and past work record to assess the Offeror's probability of successfully performing the JSF Program. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's demonstrated record of contract compliance in developing and supplying products and services that meet user's needs, including cost and schedule. The performance confidence assessment will be accomplished by reviewing aspects of an Offeror's relevant present and recent past performance (including JSF CDP performance). The information evaluated may include data on efforts performed by other divisions, subsidiaries, critical

subcontractors, or teaming contractors, if such resources will be brought to bear or significantly influence the performance of the proposed effort.

2.3.2. Relevancy. The Government evaluation team, known as the Performance Risk Assessment Group (PRAG), will identify contracts performed by the Offerors, critical subcontractors and teaming partners that may be potentially relevant to the JSF program. Potentially relevant contracts will be assessed for their level of relevancy based on the PRAG's evaluation of the extent that the work performed involves the magnitude of effort and complexities that will be required to accomplish the JSF Program, including the contract type, dollar value and schedule/milestones. The PRAG will primarily focus the performance confidence assessment on tactical aircraft contracts. However, the PRAG may assess a level of relevancy for non-tactical aircraft programs if, in the judgment of the PRAG, the contract effort includes critical portions that are essentially the same as those that are being proposed for the JSF Program. Potentially relevant contracts that are narrowly focused (e.g., contracts for only logistics support or training) may be found to be "relevant" or "somewhat relevant" if, in the judgment of the PRAG, the effort performed involves essentially the same, or much of what is being proposed for that particular effort during the JSF Program. The Government may consider as relevant, efforts performed for agencies of the federal, state, local or foreign Governments, and domestic and foreign commercial customers. The Government is not bound by the Offeror's opinion of relevancy. The Government's determination of relevancy is not constrained by the completion date of potentially relevant contracts. The following relevancy criteria apply:

VERY RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort on this contract involves essentially the same magnitude of effort and complexities that will be required to perform on the JSF program
RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort on this contract involves much of the magnitude of effort and complexities that will be required to perform on the JSF program, or essentially the same magnitude of effort and complexity for critical portions thereof
SOMEWHAT RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort on this contract involves some of the magnitude of effort and complexities that will be required to perform on the JSF program, or much of the magnitude of effort and complexity for critical portions thereof
NOT RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort on this contract does not involve any of the magnitude of effort and complexities that will be required to perform on the JSF program

2.3.3. Affordability and EMD Relevancy. For each contract reviewed, the PRAG will make two relevancy assessments, one for Affordability and one for EMD. A single contract may be deemed relevant to both Affordability and EMD, or relevant to just one.

2.3.4. Past Performance Information. The PRAG will, as deemed necessary, confirm PPI identified by Offerors in their proposals and obtain additional PPI, if available from other sources. Additional PPI will be obtained through the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting Systems (CPARS), similar systems of other Government departments and agencies, questionnaires tailored to the circumstances of this acquisition, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) channels, interviews with program

managers and contracting officers, and other sources known to the Government, including commercial sources. Offerors are to note that, in conducting this assessment, the Government reserves the right to use both data provided by the Offeror and data obtained from other sources.

2.3.5. Adverse Past Performance Information. Adverse PPI is defined as PPI that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any contract or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system. Where the performance record indicates performance problems, the Government will consider the number and severity of the problems and appropriateness and effectiveness of any corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised). The Government may review more recent contracts or performance evaluations to ensure corrective actions have been implemented and to evaluate their effectiveness. Offerors will have the opportunity to address any adverse past performance information obtained for relevant contracts (subject to the restrictions of FAR 15.306 (e)(4)), for which they have not had an opportunity to address in the past.

2.3.6. Contract Performance Ratings. The PRAG will evaluate PPI for each relevant contract (i.e., a contract found to be very relevant, relevant, or somewhat relevant) and assess contract performance rating(s). A contract that is relevant to both Affordability and EMD will be assessed both an Affordability rating and EMD rating. A contract that is relevant to only Affordability or EMD, will be assessed a contract performance rating only in the area that is relevant. Not relevant contracts will not be evaluated. In addition to evaluating the extent to which the Offeror's contract performance meets solicitation requirements, the contract performance ratings will be based on the Offeror's history of forecasting and controlling costs, adhering to schedules (including the administrative aspects of performance), and meeting performance requirements. Contract performance ratings will be assessed in accordance with the following definitions:

CONTRACT PERFORMANCE RATINGS DEFINITIONS

B	<u>Blue/Exceptional</u> - Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The performance on the contract being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.
P	<u>Purple/Very Good</u> - Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The performance on the contract being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.
G	<u>Green/Satisfactory</u> - Performance meets contractual requirements. The performance on the contract contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.
Y	<u>Yellow/Marginal</u> - Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The performance on the contract being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's

	proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.
R	<u>Red/Unsatisfactory</u> - Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The performance on the contract contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.

2.3.7. **Overall Performance Confidence Assessment Rating.** As a result of the PRAG's analysis of the risks and strengths identified in the PPI obtained for relevant contracts, each Offeror will receive a single overall Performance Confidence Assessment Rating. When determining the overall Performance Confidence Assessment Rating of an Offeror based on the PPI of another division, subsidiary, critical subcontractor or teaming partner, the PRAG will consider the business entity's proposed role on the JSF program. In the final analysis, those efforts most relevant to the effort under source selection will be considered more important in the overall Performance Confidence Assessment rating than less relevant efforts. The overall Performance Confidence Assessment Rating will be determined in accordance with the following definitions:

PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT RATING DEFINITIONS

E	<u>Exceptional/High Confidence:</u> Based on the Offeror's performance record, essentially no doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
VG	<u>Very Good/Significant Confidence:</u> Based on the Offeror's performance record, little doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
S	<u>Satisfactory/Confidence:</u> Based on the Offeror's performance record, some doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
M	<u>Marginal/Little Confidence:</u> Based on the Offeror's performance record, substantial doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.
U	<u>Unsatisfactory/No Confidence:</u> Based on the Offeror's performance record, extreme doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

2.4. **General Consideration.** The evaluation will include an assessment of the proposed contract terms and conditions. Any deviations, exceptions, restrictions or deficiencies may render a proposal unacceptable.